Applicant : Thomas W. Smith   Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544
Serial No. : 10/658,896
Filed   : · September 10, 2003
Page   : 6 of 12

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 14 and 17 are amended to recite features supported in the specification at, for example, page 6, line 6 – page 8, line 20 (corresponding to paragraphs [0019] – [0024] in U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0055424) and Fig. 2. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

The originally filed claims 1-20 stand rejected. None of the claims at this stage of prosecution is allowed or deemed allowable. None of the claims are withdrawn from consideration, and thus all have been examined. Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I.   First Obviousness Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 17, 19 and 20 as being allegedly unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 7,240,077 to Edelman *et al.* (hereinafter "Edelman"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A. Features of Independent Claims

Applicant's features are directed to system claims 1 and 14 and to method claim 17 that include a baseline web site (202) having web pages (206), a mirror web site (204), and a web application (214) running on the mirror web site, both sites being accessible through a network (110) to authorized users via client communication devices (112, 122). At least one server (108) is connected to the network (110) and hosts the baseline and mirror web sites. The web pages (206) contain information (304) stored on the server (108) for viewing via the network (110) on a computer (112) and on wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays (104) attached to walls (102) of a war-room (100).

The mirror web site (204) initially provides a mirror copy of the (primarily read-only) baseline web site (202). The mirror web site (204) subsequently accepts user-made changes to the copy and/or executes the web application. This mirror copy represents the information (304) available on the server (108), which initially incorporates the information displayed from the baseline web site (202) for subsequent modification on the mirror web site (204). The

Applicant   :   Thomas W. Smith   Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544
Serial No.   :   10/658,896
Filed   :   September 10, 2003
Page   :   7 of 12

specification describes the system such that an administrator authorizes the changes to update the baseline web site (202) to conform to the mirror web site (204). Applicant's method in claim 17 provides operations for accessing a baseline web site (202) by an authorized user through a network (110), cutting and pasting by the user to a mirror web site (204) via a web application (214), and approving and copying the changes to the baseline web site by an administrator.

Edelman does not teach or suggest a baseline web site that is primarily and ordinarily read-only, having a plurality of web pages being remotely accessible by authorized users through a network via client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network, the web pages having displayable information; a mirror web site that includes initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site and that is remotely accessible for user-made changes to mirror information on the mirror copy in a cut-and-paste manner by the authorized users through the network via the client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network; and a web application running on the mirror web site to accept the user-made changes to the mirror information on the mirror copy of the baseline web site, one or more administrators being able to authorize the user-made changes such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site, as recited in claim 1.

Also, Edelman fails to teach or suggest a method including accessing by an authorized user a baseline web site having a plurality of web pages through a network, the web pages containing displayable information; cutting and pasting changes to mirror information by the authorized user to a mirror web site that includes initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site via a web application running on the mirror web site, the mirror copy containing the mirror information; and approving the changes by an authorized administrative user to cause the changes to be copied back to the baseline web site, as recited in claim 17.

B. Teachings of Primary Reference

Instead, Edelman discloses a facility for specifying and previewing changes to a web site. See Abstract of Edelman. In particular, Edelman teaches a hosting facility 104 connected to clients 106, 108 via a network 102. The facility 104 includes several layers for data 110, tools 112 and services 114 to provide web content. The web pages are stored and transmitted as web descriptions where layout and content are stored in a database. See e.g., col. 4 lines 7-29, 48-64; col. 6 line 64 – col. 7 line 4 and Fig. 1 of Edelman.

Applicant   :   Thomas W. Smith   Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544
Serial No. :   10/658,896
Filed   :   September 10, 2003
Page   :   8 of 12

The facility performs a routine 200 in response to a request in block 204 to release scheduling information in block 208 for a new web site release for which content change information can be displayed and/or manipulated. See *e.g.*, col. 5 lines 13-55 and Fig. 2 of Edelman. Another routine 400 enables quality assurance review by identifying changes at block 408 between selected future releases and that established on the live web site. See *e.g.*, col. 6 lines 14-50 and Fig. 4 of Edelman.

Further, Edelman discloses a site merchandiser tool 150 for previewing and editing information "to the live web site 'on the fly'", thereby eschewing any inclination to employ a duplicate or mirror site. See *e.g.*, col. 7 lines 5-57 and Fig. 5 of Edelman. Moreover, Edelman teaches uploading images using an image manager tool 148 using tabs 602, 604, 608, fields 612 and directories 614 on the live web site. See *e.g.*, col. 7 line 65 – col. 8 line 42 and Fig. 6A of Edelman.

Although distinctions between Edelman and the instant claimed features may appear to be rather subtle, Applicant draws particular attention to the absence of any allusion or hint for a duplicate "mirror" web site that copies the information content from a baseline web site, subsequently enabling that information to be modified on the mirror web site and then forwarding the updated information to the baseline web site. Thus, Edelman fails to teach or suggest a <u>web application running on the mirror web site</u> to accept user-made changes to the mirror copy of the baseline web site in a cut-and-paste manner (a detail conceded at page 3 in the Office Action), [with] administrators being able to authorize the user-made changes <u>such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site</u>, as recited in Applicant's independent claims.

C. **Statutory Requirements for Obviousness**

A *prima facie* case of obviousness for a §103 rejection requires satisfaction of three basic criteria: there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the references or combine reference teachings, a reasonable expectation of success, and the references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP §706.02(j). Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to satisfy these requirements with Edelman.

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith   Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544
Serial No. : 10/658,896
Filed : September 10, 2003
Page : 9 of 12

II. Second Obviousness Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action further rejects claim 4 as being allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Edelman in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0064352 to Gordon *et al.* (hereinafter "Gordon"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant asserts that the Office Action fails to satisfy these requirements with Edelman and Gordon.

Gordon does not compensate for the deficiencies of Edelman outlined above for claim 1. Nor does Gordon teach, disclose or suggest the additional features recited in claim 4 for data represented by scanned-in information from non-electronic, hardcopy media. Instead, Gordon discloses a LeagueBoss™ database of sports information that enables entry of multiple sets of statistics for data correlation at multiple sites. In particular, Gordon teaches a services provider 11 connected to a memory 12 and to a server 13, which maintains a main website and controls communication. An administrator 20 is connected to a printer and separately by a communication link 19 to the server 13. See, for example, paragraphs [0016] – [0017] and Fig. 1 of Gordon.

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the sports database of Gordon with the changes previewer of Edelman. Although the applied references are associated with networked websites, their approaches and solutions differ from each other, and have no relationship to providing a web change management system for control of changes using a mirrored version of the database, leading to an expected lack of success from combining these teachings. Moreover, the Office Action has not established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features.

III. Third Obviousness Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action further rejects claims 8, 13, 14, 16 and 18 as being allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Edelman in view of U.S. Patent 6,313,855 to Shuping *et al.* (hereinafter "Shuping"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Edelman and Shuping, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays for mounting on walls of a room; at least one

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith
Serial No. : 10/658,896
Filed : September 10, 2003
Page : 10 of 12

Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544

server to host a baseline web site and a mirror web site, each server communicatively coupled to a network, the baseline web site being primarily and ordinarily read-only, and having a plurality of web pages for primary display on the plurality of wall-mountable, multiple user-viewable displays, the plurality of web pages being remotely accessible outside of the room by authorized users through the network via client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network, the web pages having displayable information, the mirror web site including initially a mirror copy of the baseline web site and locally accessible within the room and remotely accessible outside of the room for user-made changes to mirror information on the mirror copy in a cut-and-paste manner by the authorized users through the network via the client communication devices communicatively coupled to the network; and a web application running on the mirror web site to accept the user-made changes to the mirror information on the mirror copy of the baseline web site, one or more administrators being able to authorize the user-made changes such that the baseline web site is periodically updated from the mirror web site, the web application being receptive to additional and replacement data serving as the user-made changes to the mirror information on the mirror copy of the baseline web site in the cut-and-paste manner from other applications running on the client communication devices, as recited in claim 14.

Moreover, Shuping does not compensate for the deficiencies of Edelman outlined above for claims 1 and 17. Nor does Shuping teach, disclose or suggest the additional features recited in claims 8, 13, 18 and 20 regarding mountable, multiple user-viewable displays and additional and replacement data from an application running on a client communication device.

Instead, Shuping discloses a method of browsing websites such as Google®, enabling examination of past, present, and future links. In particular, Shuping teaches a browsing room 300 showing a current wall 310, a past wall 320 and a future wall 330, such as side-by-side and angularly off-set. Each wall corresponds to a panel of previously visited, present or intended websites. See, for example, col. 6, lines 45-62 and Fig. 3 of Shuping.

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the link browsing method of Shuping with the changes previewer of Edelman. There is no practical benefit to displaying multiple chronologically visited websites in Shuping in conjunction with template selection of page creation in Edelman. Although the applied references are associated with networked websites, their approaches and solutions differ from each other, and have no relationship to

Applicant : Thomas W. Smith Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544
Serial No. : 10/658,896
Filed : September 10, 2003
Page : 11 of 12

providing a web change management system for control of changes using a mirrored version of the database. Moreover, the Office Action has not established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features.

IV.   Fourth Obviousness Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action further rejects claim 15 as being allegedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Edelman in view of Shuping and Gordon. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Shuping and Gordon do not compensate for the deficiencies of Edelman outlined above for claim 14. Nor do Shuping and Gordon teach, disclose or suggest the additional features recited in claim 15 for scanning devices to update data. Instead, Gordon discloses an input device 23 (*e.g.*, a scanner) connected to the administrator 20 that receives data for display. See, for example, paragraph [0018] and Fig. 1 of Gordon. Meanwhile, neither Shuping nor Underwood provides any teaching of scanners for whatever context and offers no rationale for incorporating them.

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the link-browsing method of Shuping and the sports database of Gordon with the changes previewer of Edelman for reasons discussed *supra*. Moreover, the Office Action has not established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed features.

V.   Applicant's Request

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 1, 14 and 17 are patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Applicant   :   Thomas W. Smith   Attorney Docket No.: Navy Case 79544
Serial No. :   10/658,896
Filed   :   September 10, 2003
Page   :   12 of 12

VI.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerhard W. Thielman
Registration No. 43,186

Date: November 29, 2007

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
Naval Surface Warfare Center – Dahlgren Division
Office of Counsel – Code XDC1
17632 Dahlgren Road, Suite 158
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448-5110
Telephone: (540) 653-8061   **Customer No. 23501**

| DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE |
| AUTHORIZATION |
| Please grant any extension |
| necessary for entry; |
| Charge any fee due to our |
| Deposit Account No. 50-0967 |